DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 397 HE 011 067

AUTHOR Dumpson, James R.; And Others

TITLE Toward Education for Effective Social Welfare Administrative Practice.
INSTITUTION Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 53p.; May be marginally legible due to small print
AVAILABLE FROM Council on Social Work Education, 345 West 46th Street, New York, NY 10017

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Principles; Curriculum Development; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Institutional Administration; *Program Administration; Social Welfare; *Social Work
IDENTIFIERS *Council on Social Work Education

ABSTRACT

An investigation of the feasibility of a project designed to improve the effectiveness of social welfare administration is described. The study sought to determine what action might be taken for the development and implementation of curricula in social service management at interested graduate schools of social work. Literature in the field was surveyed to obtain an overview of current issues in administration and management, and a nationwide mail survey of all graduate schools of social work accredited by the Council on Social Work Education was undertaken to secure current statistical data descriptive of graduate social work education for administrative practice. Interviews were held with members of faculties in schools of social work with established concentrations in administration. In addition, information was obtained from schools of business administration, particularly those in universities without a school of social work, but that indicated a commitment to preparation of personnel for effective management in the fields of human services. A review was also made of activities underway at the Council on Social Work Education in the area of administration, and consultations were held with the executive director and his staff. Information is presented on dual degree programs, doctoral degree programs, student characteristics, employment, recruitment, faculty, grant support, interdepartmental study, and administration specialization courses. Priority needs, recommendations, and implications for future action based on reactions of four individuals are presented. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Toward Education for Effective Social Welfare Administrative Practice

by

JAMES R. DUMPSON
New York Community Trust

EDWARD J. MULLEN
University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration

RICHARD J. FIRST
Indiana University
School of Social Service

with the assistance of

WERNER P. HARDER
Lewin and Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

ED168397

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council on Social Work Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 011 067

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
NEW YORK

Copyright © 1978 by the
Council on Social Work Education, Inc.
All Rights Reserved.
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 78-62123.
Printed in the United States of America.

The opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the policy or position of the Council on Social Work Education. No official endorsement of the views presented should be inferred unless it is so indicated.

Council on Social Work Education
345 East 46th St., New York, N.Y. 10017

Foreword

This volume is the fourth published by the Council on Social Work Education within the last three years designed to stimulate and facilitate sound educational programs in social welfare administration in the curricula of schools of social work.*

James R. Dumpson, past president of the Council, Edward J. Mullen, University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration and Richard J. First, Indiana University School of Social Service, provide in these pages not only a call for action, but specific recommendations for meeting a well-documented need for the preparation of a cadre of professional social workers with the specific knowledge and skills required to administer the component parts of our extensive network of social welfare services and organizations. Their recommendations are organically linked to a cogent review of the pertinent literature and the analysis of a comprehensive survey of all accredited graduate schools of social work. Their closely reasoned plan is commented on by four distinguished social work educators, each of whom has made significant contributions to the development of leading programs of education for social welfare administration.

The Council on Social Work Education is pleased to make available this presentation of what exists, what should exist, and a thoughtful plan of how to get from here to there.

August 1978

RICHARD LODGE
Executive Director
Council on Social Work Education

* The other three are: Rino J. Patti, comp., *Management Practice in Social Welfare: An Annotated Bibliography* (1976); Kenneth J. Kazmerski and David Macarov, *Administration in the Social Work Curriculum: Report of a Survey* (1976); and Simon Slavin, *Social Administration: The Management of the Social Services* (1977).

Preface

This monograph reports the major part of an investigation supported by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation to explore the feasibility of a project designed to improve the effectiveness of social welfare administration. A number of activities were pursued to determine what next steps the Foundation might consider taking for the development and implementation of curricula in social service management at interested graduate schools of social work. The recommendations and their supporting rationale are summarized in Chapter Three. The publication of the materials presented here have the support and encouragement of the Foundation.

A survey of the literature in the field was prepared to obtain an overview of current issues in administration and management as reflected in recent professional journals and other selected scholarly publications. A nationwide mail survey of all graduate schools of social work accredited by the Council on Social Work Education was undertaken to secure current statistical data descriptive of graduate social work education for administrative practice. Interviews were held with members of faculties in schools of social work with established concentrations in administration.

In addition, either by interview or correspondence, information was secured from schools of business administration, particularly those in universities without a school of social work, but that had indicated their commitment to preparation of personnel for effective management in the fields of human services. Finally, a review was made of several activities underway at the Council on Social Work Education in the area of administration, and consultations were held with the executive director and his staff.

Sincere gratitude is expressed to the numerous educational administrators, faculty members, and social welfare agency executives who gave generously of their time and insights in helping to identify the issues and needs in education for effective administrative practice in social welfare organizations. We are keenly appreciative of the high level of cooperation we received from the graduate schools of social work—especially since they are constantly besieged during the academic year with many different types of questionnaires. Their willingness to respond to a rather detailed questionnaire and frequently to answer a follow-up inquiry is indicative of the interest shown throughout social work education in furthering sound curriculum development for the preparation of persons for administrative practice.

Particular mention must be made of those individuals in educational institutions who gave generously of their time, ideas, and recommendations. They included the deans and individual faculty members in the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, the School of Social

Administration at Temple University, and the Schools of Social Work at Rutgers University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Washington, and the University of Michigan. Also included were selected faculty from Schools of Business Administration at Stanford University, Columbia University, and the Kennedy School of Government.

Grateful acknowledgement is extended to Dr. James O. F. Hackshaw, Dr. Rino Patti, Dr. Edward E. Schwartz, and Dr. Harold H. Weissman, who reviewed the results of this investigation and discuss implications for future action in the last chapter of this monograph. The critical comments of Samuel J. Silberman from the corporate world early in the development of this project were of inestimable value in focussing on those areas in business management that should be explored, and that have applicability to effective administrative practice in the human services.

Finally, sincere appreciation is expressed to the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. The foundation's continuing interest in and concern for enhancing the delivery and effectiveness of public and private social service agencies through improvement in agency management and administration made possible this investigation and report.

It is my hope that this monograph will contribute to social work education as it seeks ways to assure more effective administrative practice in the human service field.

August 1978

JAMES R. DUMPSON
Assistant Director for Program Development and Evaluation
The New York Community Trust
and
Past President
Council on Social Work Education

Contents

FOREWORD		iii
PREFACE		v
CHAPTER ONE –	Issues of Knowledge Development in Social Welfare Administration	1
	Introduction	1
	Education for Social Welfare Administration	2
	Emerging Changes in Service Organizations and Administrative Practices	4
	Knowledge Building in Social Welfare Administration	9
	Implications for Social Work Education	15
CHAPTER TWO —	Survey of CSWE-Accredited Graduate Schools of Social Work	19
	Dual Degree Programs	19
	Reasons for not Offering an Administration Specialization	20
	Doctoral Degree Programs	20
	Student Characteristics	20
	Employment	22
	Recruitment	22
	Faculty	23
	Grant Support	23
	Interdepartmental Study	24
	Administration Specialization Courses	24
	Structure of Education for Social Welfare Administrative Practice	26
	Administration in a Planning-Policy Curriculum Context	27
	Findings and Conclusions	27
CHAPTER THREE —	Selected Findings and Conclusions	33
	Priority Needs	35
CHAPTER FOUR —	Organization and Support for New Efforts Toward Education for Effective Social Welfare Administrative Practice	37
	Recommendations	38
CHAPTER FIVE –	Implications for Future Action: Four Reactions	41
	James O. F. Hackshaw	
	Rino Patti	
	Harold H. Weissman	
	Edward E. Schwartz	

Chapter 1

Issues of Knowledge Development In Social Welfare Administration

Introduction

This literature review is concerned with the critical question of knowledge development in the field of social welfare administration. The purpose in undertaking this search of current professional literature was to identify what is known about social welfare administration and the management of human service organizations. Particular attention was given to the selection of material with implications for planning new directions in education for social welfare administration.

One dimension of the problem facing social work education in this field of practice can be defined as the dissemination and utilization of new knowledge. A substantial body of literature has developed around the performance of social welfare organizations and programs. Additionally, there is a significant body of knowledge in the field of management that offers potential for transferability to the problems faced by administrators in social welfare organizations. To date there have been very few attempts to order the vast amount of material in the fields of mental health, public social services, health care, public administration, and business management in a manner that lends itself to teaching and learning in the context of professional education in social work. Further understanding of the current state of knowledge would seem to be a necessary requisite for the design of more effective educational programs in this critical area of social work practice.

The framework for this review emerged from the authors' efforts to identify from the literature issues in practice and topics in administrative theory that merit further inquiry. A significant number of topics have been included, along with a brief commentary and limited analysis of their implications. This search began in 1976 with the bibliography compiled by Patti and published by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).[1] Subsequent steps were taken to expand the search for theoretical material and topics not found in the current social welfare literature. Additionally, a number of conference papers, reports, and related materials were examined and found to be highly relevant to the identification of issues in social work education.

Although particular attention was given to empirical studies of human service organizations and administrative practice, the authors found that many of the journal articles and studies in organization and management presented a familiar set of problems: the conclusions were speculative, the studies lacked replication, and the findings were subject to situational factors that defied concrete application in social welfare settings. The most fundamental issues in knowledge development and utilization relate to the need for (1) systematic formulation of analytic frameworks for ordering existing knowledge, (2) conduct of baseline descriptive studies on the nature of management practice, and (3) translation of new knowledge into actions by professionals engaged in the actual management of social programs.

Education for Social Welfare Administration

As a starting point for this review it is important to identify where we currently stand in the educational preparation of social workers for administrative and managerial roles. Curriculum planning in this area of practice is rapidly emerging as a major issue in graduate schools of social work. The educational thrust is toward specialized programs or concentrations in policy, planning, and administration at the MSW level.

Although the number of schools offering a specialization in administrative practice has increased significantly, annual statistical data from CSWE indicates that the percentage of graduate social work students electing an administrative concentration has not shown a significant change. Neugeboren's analysis of this data indicates that the mean percentage of students majoring in administration was 1.5 percent for the years 1968-71, in comparison with a mean of 3 percent for the years 1972-75. The change in total percentage of students in all macro areas for the same period was from 10 to 12 percent.[2]

This distribution of students and educational resources is in sharp contrast to the percentage of practicing MSWs in administrative and supervisory roles. A survey of the National Association of Social Workers' membership indicated that half the respondents were employed in administrative and supervisory positions.[3] Schools undertaking follow-up studies of their graduates have found that the proportion of graduates engaged in this area of practice is frequently higher than expected and on the increase. For example, Powers found that within two years of graduation, over 70 percent of the Marywood College MSW graduates were devoting in excess of 50 percent of their time to planning, management, and related duties other than direct service. This is in contrast to the fact that 73 percent of these respondents identified micro or direct practice as their primary professional goal at the time of entrance into the MSW program.[4] These findings would seem to indicate a major discontinuity between the interests and educational preparation of graduate students and their subsequent roles in practice.

Numerous conference papers and other published documents were found in which social work eduators addressed this issue and the need to prepare larger numbers of MSWs to assume administrative roles. The more frequent casual assumptions found in this literature identified as significant factors changes in professional roles and functions, the growth and complexity of the social welfare enterprise, and mandates for greater accountability. Sarri defined the issue as follows:

> social workers must have vastly different competencies if they are to maintain positions of leadership in public social services. Traditionally, we have trained people to be more interested in the methodologies of social service than in the politics, planning, and administration of public welfare. It is now entirely possible that the largest segment of the social welfare enterprise could exist without any involvement of social workers in the design and management of state-wide systems of public social services.[5]

A more recent and strident tone was offered by O'Reilly: "I submit that unless we use our resources to capture and manage strategic strong points in the social service system, whatever else we do will be in vain."[6] The central thesis in these papers and others is the need for "basic change" in professional education.[7] Limited attention has been given to identifying the barriers to education in social work administration. Neugeboren developed the position that barriers to education in administration may be understood in terms of ideological and political factors:

> Ideological factors are associated with the belief that the foundation of *all* social work practice is skill in direct service to clients. This belief, which is transmitted by faculty and graduates, has maintained the image that social work practice is predominantly helping on a one-to-one basis. The political factors linked with the maintenance of the status quo, in which micro education is dominant, relate to self-interests of various groups, internal and external, to schools of social work.[8]

Data from the survey of graduate schools are reported in Chapter 2 of this monograph. Qualitative analysis of the questionnaires and supporting documents indicated considerable uncertainty on the part of those engaged in curriculum development. This was found to be particularly true of efforts to define relevant content for administrative methods courses and in the design of field instruction. Kazmerski and Macarov offered the following conclusion from their survey of graduate schools of social work:

> Finally, the relatively short history of education for social work administration on a large scale, and the difficult problems of conceptualization and implementation outlined in this report, combine to make both inevitable and desirable a good deal of experimentation, innovation, and experiential learning concerning teaching social work administration.[9]

It may be that far too little is known about the methods that are effective in social administration to present a body of knowledge that can be applied in the field. One starting point is to prepare students and practitioners for active engagement in knowledge building. Gummer suggested that the educational design can be viewed as a model of what exists in practice and that various designs can be classified in relation to the extent to which they accurately represent the realities of practice.[10]

The critical questions in selecting a particular theoretical framework are (1) to what extent does the theory or set of constructs explain what actually exists in the context of particular social service organizations, and (2) to what extent does a given theoretical framework serve to guide the actions of administrative actors in choosing between alternative courses of action?

Argyris and Schon took the position that professional schools tend to be preoccupied with established competencies and exclude emerging competencies at a time when professional roles are undergoing radical change.[11] The authors' literature review indicated that changes in the utilization of social work manpower have resulted in a number of unresolved dilemmas for professional education. The current situation can be summarized as follows:

1. BSW graduates are assuming entry-level roles in service delivery.
2. MSW graduates are occupying positions in complex bureaucracies that call for very different roles than those performed in the small voluntary social agencies of the past.
3. Faculty and administration in graduate schools of social work operate with limited information on emerging patterns in practice and empirical data upon which to build educational designs.
4. Practice methods in administration and management, resource materials, and research are relatively underdeveloped.
5. A significantly large number of social welfare organizations are administered by social workers who have no formal training in modern management methods.

Emerging Changes in Service Organizations and Administrative Practices

In the most recent edition of the *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, Sarri identified five major areas of external influence as having a profound impact on the administration of social agencies:

1. Change in societal mandates as a result of new laws, administrative rulings, technical knowledge and social values.
2. Change in the behavior of clients as consumers of agency services require new modes of problem-solving and decision-making to assure broader participation.

3. Change in the roles of staff and greater use of technical and paraprofessional staff in specialized roles.
4. Growth in the size and complexity of the welfare enterprise to the extent where management of the system is one of the more problem-filled areas of government in metropolitan communities.
5. New knowledge and information about human behavior, intervention strategies and organizational design.[12]

The significance of these changes in the environmental context are expressed in Schon's definition of the central issue as "adjustment to loss of the stable state."[13] The following analysis by La Porte of the condition facing public sector organizations would seem to characterize the prevailing organizational context for social welfare administration:

> The most salient environmental feature for public organizations in most of the modern world is a social fabric which is highly *differentiated* into a multitude of institutions and organizations of greatly varied size bound together with increasing *interdependence*. While social interdependence has always been considerable in a kind of unconscious, organic sense, we now experience the interdependent consequences of *intended* relationships. Our organizational systems are more consciously linked to one another and are often designed to increase interdependence.
>
> Faced with these conditions, public organizations are confronted with the necessity to respond to increasingly widespread *environmental uncertainty* and *technological complexity*.[14]

Table 1 is a summary of selected characteristics of human service organizations and their impact on administrative functions. The material is designed to highlight two types of contextual variables: the type of organization (human service) and the nature of the primary organizational task (service delivery). Organizational characteristics reflect an open system view of organization and management. The corresponding implications reflect the authors' synthesis of critical issues in administering each of the three major levels in human service organizations. The three organizational levels are based on Parsons' framework as utilized by Pettit, Ritvo, and others in conceptualizing the relationship between organizational characteristics and managerial functions.[15]

The institutional level in human service organizations serves to link the organization with the task environment—those parts of the environment that are relevant or potentially relevant to the goals of the organization. The boundaries between the organization and its environment are relatively open or highly permeable. In establishing or changing its domain, the organization enters into different types of exchange that create interdependency with elements in the environment.

The latter creates a set of conditions that best can be defined as relative uncertainty. However, efforts to obtain flexibility may actually increase

uncertainty, thereby creating the need for what Thompson called "co-alignment" between the reduction of uncertainty and the flexibility for action.[16]

Interventive efforts at the institutional level are subject to multiple contingencies and constraints. The factors which interact to produce given outcomes may well be of such magnitude that the management is unable to achieve the necessary organizational adaptation and change in inter-organizational relations.

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Human Service Organizations

Selected Organizational Characteristics by System Level	Implications for Management
I. INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	
1. *Complexity* Complex networks of shifting resource inputs and inter-organizational linkages.	1a. Limited control over inputs and over resource structure. 1b. Patterns of management activity dependent on external policies and mandates.
2. *Environmental Turbulence* Uncertainties threaten stability of the organizational domain.	2a. Structural change and adaptation are ongoing tasks. 2b. Need for greater administrative flexibility, thereby increasing uncertainty in the technical core.
3. *Boundaries* Highly permeable, relatively open and undifferentiated.	3a. Boundary control necessary for organizational survival. 3b. Ongoing structural change to achieve adaptation.
II. ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL	
1. *Performance Structure* High degree of discrepancy between institutional demands and organizational capacity.	1a. Efficiency and effectiveness linked to use of new service technologies and production systems. 1b. Lag in innovation and change in management practices. 1c. Internal differentiation and integration critical to information flow.

2. *Resource Structure* Limited control over inputs.	2a. Need for priorities in resource allocations 2b. Growth and expansion dependent on political-economic factors.
3. *Control Mechanism* Managerial control confined to technical tasks and roles, subject to pluralistic mechanisms.	3a. Information and knowledge of outcomes limited by feedback mechanisms. 3b. Hierarchal authority and bureaucratic customs ineffective in managing environmental turbulence.

III. TECHNICAL CORE

1. *Technology* Mediating technology, interdependency between service providers and consumers.	1. Standardization of activities difficult to achieve.
2. *Personnel* Dependence on professional manpower in use of core technologies.	2. Authority and standards of productivity rest in peer review rather than bureaucratic control.
3. *Boundaries* Relatively closed and buffered from environmental turbulence.	3. Lack of congruency and responsiveness to change in organizational goals and societal mandates.

The most critical forms of interventive action are concerned with adaptation to environmental turbulence and change. Cyert and March, in studying profit-making corporations, noted that "firms will devise and negotiate an environment so as to eliminate the uncertainty. Rather than treat the environment as exogenous and to be predicted, they seek ways to make it controllable."[17] We do not know the extent, means, and effectiveness of efforts to do this in human service organizations. Seeking ways to make the environment controllable involves purposive actions to change the relationship of a system to its environment. Chin defined three fundamental approaches:

> 1. Change the properties of the environment of the system.
> 2. Change the interrelationship of the system to the environment.
> 3. Change either the internal characteristics of the system such as its awareness, perceptions, and images of the environment, or its internal responsiveness to the changing environment.[18]

Design of Service Systems and Organizational Structure

Two major issues in service delivery with direct implications for management practice are change in interorganizational arrangements and demands for greater accountability. With the advent of the Title XX Amendments to the Social Security Act, which increased emphasis on program evaluation and related developments, administrators have been faced with the need for new knowledge of complex systems for planning and control. One of the major themes in the social policy literature is the redesign of service delivery systems. Since the early 1970s, particular attention has been given to the question of service integration and the problem of coordination in the human services.

Agranoff suggested that service integration is a new name for old efforts to bring agencies and services together, with the new dimension being the "movement" to coordinate both public and nonpublic agencies and programs and to consolidate related public programs.[19]

Aiken et al. identified characteristics common to social service delivery systems: *comprehensiveness* (extensiveness and fullness of components), *compatibility* (the degree to which components are linked together), and *cooperation* (the degree to which collaboration and integration exist among the elements). Institutional barriers to coordination are organizational autonomy, professional ideologies, clients' interests, resource controllers' values, and multiple local governments.[20]

Administrators are faced with numerous situational contingencies and constraints upon their efforts to design more effective service delivery systems. The literature reflects two major approaches to this problem: the use (and sometimes misuse) of information science and related modern management techniques; and the professional training, competencies, and practices of social workers and related professionals engaged in the administration of social welfare organizations.

One of the most significant ways in which management ability expresses itself is in the creation and change of service systems. Far too frequently though, structure is merely the result of a haphazard process of evolution, and has no particular relationship to the needs, aspirations, or competencies of the people in it and even less to the external environment.

System design is a critical issue in social welfare organizations. Human service organizations have become increasingly complex and bureaucratic at a point in time when environmental conditions demand more open and adaptive structural arrangements.

Kast and Rosenzweig summarized the more conclusive findings on systems design as follows:

> 1. The closed/stable/mechanistic organizational form is more appropriate for routine activities where productivity is a major objective, and/or technology is relatively uniform and stable; where decision-making is programmable; and where environmental forces are relatively stable and certain.

2. The open/adaptive/organic organizational form is more appropriate for non-routine activities where creativity and innovation are important; where heuristic decision-making processes are necessary; and where the environment is relatively uncertain and turbulent.[21]

Structure must be related to the environmental conditions and the production or technological system in a given organization at a certain point in time. Thus the most appropriate or adaptive form is not fixed. The critical issue for management is how to achieve the best fit between the task of the organization, the environment, and the technology. Very little writing on this subject has appeared in the social welfare literature.

Knowledge Building in Social Welfare Administration

The present state of administrative theory is highly prescriptive and axiomatic, offering principles and normative views of what ought to be. The result is a methodological vacuum—constructs that are far too abstract to guide or assess the effectiveness of specific interventive actions.

Traditional administrative theory rests on assumptions of rationality and stability as the means and ends for interventive actions. The assumption is made that administrative action will serve to stabilize organizational processes and reduce uncertainty. Proactive forms of intervention are advocated in the general management literature as the means for reducing environmental uncertainty. For example, Cyert and March, in studying profit-making firms, noted that corporations will devise and negotiate an environment in order to eliminate uncertainty. Rather than treating the environment as exogenous, they seek ways to make it controllable.[22]

We know very little about the extent and effectiveness of efforts to do this in human service organizations. Administrative intervention in service organizations involves a wide range of activities and judgmental actions that have not been subjected to critical inquiry. Thus the question of what constitutes effective performance is subject to debate and contest, given our limited understanding of the factors that explain variance in the administrative phenomena.

Various general principles and techniques for more effective management can be found in the social work, public administration, and general management literature. However, these normative prescriptions and guidelines for action are of limited utility without further research on the outcomes that result from alternative courses of action. The so-called administrative theory jungle[23] has been aptly characterized by Dunn and Fozouni as a chaotic array of fragmented assumptions, prescriptions, and disorganized beliefs about public sector management.[24]

Theory that is to facilitate the practice and teaching of social work administration will necessitate further understanding of three critical dimensions:

1. The patterns of managerial activity in various types and at different levels in service organization.
2. The bureaucratic, political, technical, and behavioral factors which interact to influence the performance of administrative actors.
3. The effectiveness of managerial systems, administrative actions, and strategies for the management of change.

The following is a summary of the limited empirical findings and conceptual issues in relation to each of these three topics in knowledge development.

Patterns of Management Activity

Typical definitions of management activity begin either by identifying functions such as planning, organizing, and controlling or by focusing upon one central task (such as decision making). The breadth, variety, and interdependency of management activities make it exceedingly difficult to define and classify these activities in concrete terms. Yet knowledge of what social program managers *actually do* is a basic requisite for curriculum development and in the design of more effective organizational arrangements.

Hawkes examined administrative roles over a two-year period in a psychiatric hospital setting. The author conceptualized the administrator's function as a boundary position in relation to three interacting role sets: (1) sources of political, legal, and financial support, (2) sources of technical and professional support, and (3) persons in the problem population.[25]

Mintzberg studied executives in major corporations and found that administrators at the top spent the greatest bulk of their time responding to high-pressure disturbances. "Disturbances arise ... not only because poor managers ignore situations until they reach crisis proportions, but also because good managers cannot possibly anticipate all the consequences of the action they take." Mintzberg contended that finding out what the job is constitutes the first step in specifying what managers are to learn. Three role categories were formulated from the observational data: (1) interpersonal roles (figurehead, leader, and liaison); (2) informational roles (monitor, disseminator, and spokesman); and (3) decisional roles (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resources allocator, and negotiator).[26]

There are a number of studies available that describe the activities performed by executives in large corporations and at other levels of management in business firms.[27] Based on a preliminary review of these studies, there are both useful methodological implications and numerous problems in applying the findings to human service organizations. For example, Skeaff found that the majority of personal judgments of foremen were incorrect as compared with how they actually spent their time.[28]

At this juncture there are no comparative studies on how professionals with

preparation in social work versus business or public administration function in comparable settings.

Kaeser and Frey, and Patti et al. collected data from social service administrators in their respective states (Oregon and Washington) as part of efforts to ground the educational design in graduate schools of social work. The Oregon study involved interviews with 81 executives and lower-level administrators in a sample of urban and rural social service agencies in the state. The respondents said that approximately one-third of their time was devoted to "relating to external forces." Although there is no operational definition or further breakdown given for this category (referred to by the authors as "boundary work activity" such as planning with other agency executives and meeting with citizen advisory groups), this does account for a significant aspect of the administrator's time. The remaining two-thirds of the administrator's time was reported as being equally divided between program management, and personnel and financial management.[29]

The Washington State survey (purposive sample of 90 social service managers) provided a more descriptive analysis of the patterns of management activity. Utilizing self-recording by respondents in a sample week, activities were grouped in 13 functional categories. The findings indicated a wide array of tasks and activities. For example, as shown in Table 2, the respondents devoted at

TABLE 2
Mean Hours Spent in All Activities by Managers

Activity	Mean Hours
Planning	3.9
Information Processing	6.2
Controlling	5.4
Coordinating	3.8
Evaluating	1.5
Negotiating	.8
Representing	1.8
Staffing	.9
Supervising	6.7
Supplying	.3
Extracurricular	1.9
Direct Practice	4.1
Budgeting	1.0

SOURCE: R. J. Patti et al., *Educating for Management in Social Welfare: A Report of the Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project* (Seattle, Wash.: The School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington, July 1976), p. 32.

least one hour per week to 10 different types of activities.[30]

The largest category, information processing, encompassed recording, reports, correspondence, telephone calls, filling out forms, and routine communications. Activities associated with supervising, controlling, planning, and coordinating would appear to form a constellation accounting for approximately one-half (19.8 hours) of the manager's time in the sample work week. In comparing the significance managers attach to the activities with reported time allocations, the authors noted:

> Information processing and direct practice are among the most time-consuming activities, b t tend to be viewed as less important to effective managerial performanc . While relatively little time was spent on representing and negotiating, a disproportionate number of managers judged these to be among the most significant activities they performed. This may suggest that though a relatively small number of managers are engaged in these activities, those who are tend to consider them essential to effective job performance. Managers spent relatively little time in activities related to evaluating, budgeting, staffing and supplying, and generally did not consider these tasks centrally important to their functioning.[31]

Given the limited number of exploratory studies on the nature of management work and the different approaches used to categorize activities, we are left with the problem of how to order the relative importance of numerous roles, tasks, and skills. Principles and theoretical propositions are numerous. Given as the underlying problem is the lack of adequate operational theory of system and subsystem management that can provide definitive answers to specific organizational problems.

Theory that is to facilitate management practice in human service organizations is dependent upon our understanding of both the patterns and the interrelationships of management action. Grounding constructs in observable patterns of action can provide the basis for development and testing of propositions that reflect the conditions under which social program management occurs.

Administrative Performance

The questions of how to increase managerial effectiveness and to improve performance, morale, and productivity are critical issues in human service organizations. No suitable definition was found as to what constitutes managerial effectiveness in service organizations. This would seem to be a critical issue and requisite for the development of education and training programs related to this field of practice. There are many normative principles regarding administrative performance in the public sector. For example, Drucker emphasized the estab-

lishment of priorities as the most critical and necessary activity in the management of public institutions. Additionally, he focused on the corollary task of identifying "posteriorities"—activities to be delayed or abandoned.[32] Schultze asserted that the inadequacy of performance measures in public sector decision making results in risk avoidance by personnel in those institutions. Because success is not so easily identified as mistakes, there is a greater need for incentives to motivate employees to perform effectively.[33]

The topic of administrative performance involves a multitude of issues, some empirical data on causal variables, and no evidence of how the profession establishes standards for performance. Standards and guidelines do not exist for evaluating the professional.[34] It would appear that social work administrators acquire their skills on the job and that very little research has been carried out with respect to the effectiveness of persons assuming these critical roles. Research findings have direct implications for (1) the selection of managers to fill positions, (2) analysis of what administrators do, and (3) efforts to increase professional effectiveness.

Issues with respect to administrative performance are commonly identified by organizational participants, but less frequently addressed in the empirical research literature. Causal variables are generally assumed to relate either to the leadership style or contingencies in the agency environment. Much of the research and related literature in this topic area is concerned with the personal characteristics and behavioral actions of individuals who fill administrative positions.

Carlson looked at the question of who is selected to assume administrative roles in public school systems and found that superintendents promoted from within gave primary emphasis to stabilizing and maintaining the system, whereas outsiders were more likely to be professionally mobile, innovative, and change-oriented.[35]

Fiedler examined the question of leadership style as related to contingencies in the job situation, and found that situational favorableness and the motivational system used by the leader were two significant interacting variables. The author identified two styles of leadership: task-motivated and relationship-motivated. His research and the supporting data from related studies demonstrated that leaders operate most effectively in situations that are favorable to their personal style. Thus a leader with a task-motivated style could be expected to perform ineffectively in an organization or situation calling for a more interactive and relational style of leadership. These findings support the proposition that it is easier to fit the job to the manager than it is to change the manager's style of leadership to fit the demands of a particular job.[36]

Transactions between the administrator and professional staff are frequently discussed in the social work literature. For example, Berliner described the

pitfalls that administrators in family service agencies experience when moving from supervisory to executive positions.[37]

The interrelated questions of authority, power, and participation in decision making are critical variables. The achievement motives of industrial entrepreneurs have been studied over a number of years by McClelland. The author classified two types of managers: the affiliative driven (those who have a greater need for fellowship than for power and influence), and the power driven (those who desire to influence and lead others). Two types of power managers were classified: those who seek personal power and those who seek institutional power. The institutional leader was found to be the most effective, since subordinates responded out of an identification with the organization rather than as a condition of personal loyalty to the executive.[38]

Studies on managerial behavior have not revealed clear-cut findings on the relationship of leadership to organizational performance outcomes.[39] However, there clearly are a number of factors that do relate to professional effectiveness.

Characteristics of the Managerial System

Ackoff asserted that a management system should perform four functions: (1) identify problems, (2) make decisions, (3) control the decisions made, and (4) provide the information required to perform each of the first three functions.[40]

Two schools of thought exist concerning the managerial function in human service organizations. On the one hand are those who emphasize the commonalities of management in all types of organizations;[41] on the other hand are those who emphasize the differences between service or governmental organizations and private enterprise. Comparative analysis of the two types of organizations has identified a wide array of variable properties with direct implications for differential management practices.[42]

Dahl and Lindblom distinguished between organizations according to the type of control systems that were evident. They used the term "enterprise" to identify organizations controlled by a price system, and the term "agency" to denote organizations centrally controlled through forms of polyarchy or hierarchy. They viewed the lack of incentive provided in private organizations by cost reduction as a significant influence on managerial actions.[43]

Sherwood and Page defined characteristics of public organizations and their administration as follows:

> 1. They usually are allocated work too risky or too ill-defined.
> 2. For political reasons, their stated objective is frequently not their real objective.
> 3. No commonly accepted standards exist for monitoring their performance or measuring their achievement.[44]

Drucker's comparative analysis of managerial systems in public and profit-

making organizations suggested that public sector management also can be characterized by the failure to establish priorities.[45]

One of the more frequently discussed approaches to change in the managerial system for social welfare programs is development of the capacity for processing and utilizing informational feedback in administrative decision making. Holland stated:

> In order to foster more responsive and effective service systems, planners of human service programs are developing extensive procedures for obtaining and utilizing information about targeted human needs, and are monitoring and evaluating the impacts of alternative services upon such needs. Program-relevant findings must then be transmitted to the decision-makers and administrators of programs for use in modifying and reshaping services. The processes of collecting, assessing, and utilizing such information are crucial to the design and management of more effective services. In actual practice, however, decisions often seem to be made upon the basis of quite limited information. Thus, new knowledge and research findings can often go unrecognized and unused.[46]

A more specific and operational issue is the question of how to utilize information technology. Simon provided a concise view of the impact of information technology on public sector organizations. He contended that the development of mechanized information processing involves a fundamental change in technology. The technology involves quantification of information for the purpose of achieving rationality in decision making.[47]

Why is the utilization of such systems problematic? McFarlan conducted a study of business organizations and found that the critical variable with respect to the effectiveness of information systems was the organization's prior experience in systematic planning processes. Organizations that had engaged in systematic planning prior to the installation of computer-based systems were more effective users of such systems when they were implemented.[48]

Implications for Social Work Education

There is perhaps no more critical issue confronting the social work profession today than the need for personnel with competencies in managing the implementation of complex social programs.

Implementation of major social programs is a highly involved process that includes numerous political, technical, and behavioral elements. Recent evaluation studies suggest that "failure of a program may as often be due to faulty implementation as to ineffective treatments."[49] Williams went even further in stating that "we simply do not know how to implement complex new programs or program modifications."[50]

To what extent are schools of social work prepared to meet this challenge and engage in the types of research and teaching that will be needed for educational

innovations in this area of social work practice? The conference papers, reports, and survey data reviewed in the course of this literature search indicated that social welfare policy, planning, and administration have emerged as legitimate areas for practice specialization in graduate social work education. Additionally, there is a relatively small but growing number of educators and administrators who are devoting their energies to practice research, the development of instructional materials, demonstration of new methods for teaching-learning, and related efforts at knowledge building. The results of these efforts are only beginning to appear in the professional literature.

The development of new paradigms in education and practice would seem to be feasible at this time. One of the next critical steps is to devise the structures and support systems for more concerted action and exchange of information among the individuals and organizations prepared to offer leadership in this endeavor. We may find that the social work profession has not only a claim on the management of social welfare agencies, but a distinctive body of knowledge, values, and skills that can be transmitted to those professionals who assume leadership roles in the implementation of complex social programs and design of systems for more effective service delivery.

Notes

1. R. J. Patti, *Management Practice in Social Welfare: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976).
2. B. Neugeboren, "Barriers to Education in Social Work Administration" (Paper presented at the Council on Social Work Education Annual Program Meeting, Phoenix, March 1977).
3. A. M. Stamm, "NASW Membership: Characteristics, Deployment and Salaries," *Personnel Information*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1969), pp. 34-45.
4. G. T. Powers, *A Survey of Past Students of the School of Social Work, Marywood College* (Scranton, Pa.: Marywood College, July 27, 1973).
5. R. Sarri, "Effective Social Work Intervention in Administrative and Planning Roles: Implications for Education," in *Facing the Challenge*, ed. Scott Briar et al. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973), pp. 33-34.
6. C. T. O'Reilly, "A Strategy for Management Education in Schools of Social Work," in *Report of the Seminar on Curriculum Development: Management and Administration of Social Welfare Organizations*, ed. J. O. F. Hackshaw (New York: New York State Association of Deans of Social Work Schools, November 1976), p. 4.
7. M. Shapiro, "Reflections on the Preparation of Social Workers for Executive Positions," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 7 (Winter 1971), pp. 55-68.
8. Neugeboren, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
9. K. J. Kazmerski and D. Macarov, *Administration in the Social Work Curriculum: Report of a Survey* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976), p. 35.
10. B. Gummer, "Social Planning and Social Administration: Implications for Curriculum Development," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 11 (Winter 1975), pp. 66-73.
11. C. Argyris and D. Schon, *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).
12. R. Sarri, "Administration in Social Welfare," in *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, ed. John Turner (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1977), pp. 42-51.
13. D. A. Schon, *Beyond the Stable State* (New York: Random House, 1971).
14. T. R. LaPorte, "The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organizations," in *Toward a New Public Administration*, ed. Frank Marini (Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 1974).

15. T. Parsons, *Structure and Process in Modern Societies* (New York: Free Press, 1960); T. A. Petit, "A Behavioral Theory of Management," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 10 (December 1967), pp. 341-50; and R. A. Ritvo, "Organizational and Environmental Dynamics: A Multi-Hospital Study of the Role of Boards of Trustees" (Doctoral diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1976).
16. J. B. Thompson, *Organizations in Action: Social Science Basis of Administrative Theory* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).
17. R. M. Cyert and J. G. March, *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1963), p. 120.
18. Robert Chin, "The Utility of Models of the Environments of Systems for Practitioners," in *The Planning of Change*, 3rd ed., ed. Warren Bennis, Kenneth Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth Corey (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 110.
19. R. Agranoff, "Service Integration," in *Managing Human Services*, ed. Wayne Anderson (Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1977).
20. M. Aiken et al., *Coordinating Human Services* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).
21. S. E. Kast and J. E. Rosenweig, *Organization and Management: A Systems Approach* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 331.
22. Cyert and March, *op. cit.*
23. H. Koontz and C. O'Donnell, *Management: A Systems and Contingency Analysis of Managerial Functions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974).
24. W. N. Dunn and B. Fozouni, *Toward a Critical Administrative Theory*, Sage Professional Paper in Administrative and Policy Studies, Series 3 (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1976).
25. R. W. Hawkes, "The Role of the Psychiatric Administrator," in *Human Service Organizations*, ed. Y. Hasenfeld and R. A. English (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974).
26. H. Mintzberg, "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 53 (July-August 1975), pp. 49-61.
27. J. A. Haas, A. M. Porat, and J. A. Vaughan, "Actual vs. Ideal Time Allocations Reported by Managers: A Study of Managerial Behavior," *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 22 (Spring 1967), pp. 61-75; J. K. Hemphill, *Dimensions of Executive Positions*, Research Monograph no. 98 (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1960); K. McLennan, "The Manager and His Job Skills," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 10 (September 1967), pp. 235-45; Mintzberg, *op. cit.*; L. A. Sayles and M. K. Chandler, *Managing Large Systems: Organizations for the Future* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971); L. J. M. Skeaff, "What Do Managers Do?" *Personnel Journal*, Vol. 46 (1967), pp. 630-37; and R. Stewart, *Managers and Their Jobs* (London: MacMillan, 1967).
28. Skeaff, *op. cit.*
29. L. Kaeser, G. Frey, P. Leonard, and B. Romaine, *Educating for Management* (Portland, Oregon: School of Social Work, Portland State University, June 12, 1975).
30. R. J. Patti et al., *Educating for Management in Social Welfare: A Report of the Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project* (Seattle, Wash.: The School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington, July 1976).
31. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
32. P. F. Drucker, "Managing the Public Service Institution," *The Public Interest*, Vol. 33 (Fall 1973), pp. 43-60.
33. C. L. Schultze, "The Role of Incentives, Penalties, and Rewards in Attaining Effective Policy," in *Public Expenditures and Policy Analysis*, ed. R. H. Haveman and J. Margolis (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970).
34. J. H. Kahle, "Structuring and Administering a Modern Voluntary Agency," *Social Work*, Vol. 14 (October 1969), pp. 21-28.
35. R. O. Carlson, "Succession and Performance Among School Superintendents," in Hasenfeld and English, *op. cit.*
36. F. E. Fiedler, "Engineering a Job to Fit the Manager," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 43 (September-October 1965), pp. 115-23.
37. A. K. Berliner, "Some Pitfalls in Administrative Behavior," *Social Casework*, Vol. 52 (1971), pp. 562-66.
38. D. C. McClelland and D. H. Burnham, "Power-Driven Managers: Good Guys Make Bum

Bosses," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 9 (December 1975), pp. 69-70.
39. J. P. Campbell, M. D. Dunnette, E. E. Lawler, E. Edward, and K. E. Weick, Jr., *Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).
40. R. L. Ackoff, *Redesigning the Future: A Systems Approach to Societal Problems* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974).
41. A. M. Murray, "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (1975), pp. 364-71.
42. H. G. Rainey, R. W. Backoff, and C. H. Levine, "Comparing Public and Private Organizations," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1976), pp. 233-44.
43. R. A. Dahl and C. Linblom, *Politics, Economics and Welfare*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), pp. 456-69.
44. F. Sherwood and W. Page, "MBO and Public Management," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1976), pp. 5-12.
45. Drucker, *op. cit.*
46. T. P. Holland, *Information Utilization and Decision-Making in Human Service Organizations* (Cleveland, Ohio: Human Services Design Laboratory, Case Western Reserve University, 1975), p. 1.
47. H. A. Simon, "Applying Information Technology to Organization Design," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 33 (1973), pp. 268-78.
48. F. W. McFarlan, "Problems in Planning Information Systems," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 49 (March-April 1971), pp. 75-90.
49. P. H. Rossi and S. R. Wright, "Evaluation Research: An Assessment of Theory, Practice, and Politics," *Evaluation Quarterly*, Vol. 1 (February 1977), p. 23.
50. W. Williams, "Implementation Analysis and Assessment," *Policy Analysis*, Vol. 1 (Summer 1975), pp. 531-66.

Chapter 2

Survey of CSWE-Accredited Graduate Schools of Social Work

This chapter describes the results of a national survey of all Council on Social Work Education accredited graduate schools of social work conducted during the 1976-1977 academic year. The survey was designed to secure current statistical data descriptive of graduate education for social welfare administrative practice.[1] In addition, the survey sought to collect qualitative information concerning the issues in education for social welfare administrative practice that have been identified in the literature survey discussed in Chapter 1.

A questionnaire was mailed to 84 CSWE-accredited graduate schools of social work in October 1976. By the following March, 61 (73%) replies had been received.[2] Of those responding, 35 (57%) reported that they currently offered a specialization in social welfare administrative practice at the master's level. The number of full-time students enrolled in this specialization ranged from 2 to 82. The median number of students was 17.[3] In most schools the specialization in administration had been developed recently. Twenty-four schools (73%) reported that it had been offered for 5 or fewer years. The range extended from less than one to 57 years, with a median of 4.

Dual Degree Programs

Seven (11%) of the responding schools reported the existence of dual degree programs with other graduate schools or divisions within their universities.[4] Four of the seven offered master's degrees in social work and public administration (MPA) in collaboration with their university's School of Public Administration,[5] while three offered master's degrees in social work and business administration (MBA) in collaboration with their university's Graduate School of Business.[6] The seven dual degree programs required from two to three years of full-time study. Student enrollment ranged from 9 to 19, with a median of 8. The dual degree programs were a recent development, with all but one program initiated in the two years previous to the study. In addition to the seven established programs three schools reported that they were considering such programs.

Reasons for Not Offering an Administration Specialization

Of the 26 (43%) responding schools reporting no administration specialization, the most frequently mentioned reasons were: (1) lack of resources to implement such a program, (2) lack of student interest, (3) insufficient numbers of qualified faculty, and (4) a belief that such a specialization was not needed. Other reasons cited related to the organization of the curriculum (other than by method), a specialized direct service focus for the entire program, a lack of university support for such a specialization, and insufficient high quality field placements in administration.

Doctoral Degree Programs

Nine (15%) of the responding programs reported offering specializations in administration in their doctoral programs. Similar to the master's programs, the doctoral specializations tended to be a recent development, with five of the nine respondents reporting that the specialization had been developed within the two years previous to the study.[7] Three of the remaining four programs reported that theirs had been developed five to eight years previous.[8] By far the most senior of the programs was that at Columbia University, which reported that its specialization had been in existence for 25 years. It also accounted for over one-third of the enrolled students reported by the nine doctoral programs (31 of 84). The remaining eight programs reported enrollments ranging from one to 14 students, with a median of 5.5.

Two years of planned study, exclusive of the dissertation, was usually required to complete the doctorate. None of the programs reported the existence of a dual degree program at the doctoral or post-master's levels. Five of the universities award a DSW degree, with the remaining three awarding a PhD.

Two programs reported a formal post-master's, nondoctoral program in social welfare administration. Temple University grants a certificate in the Administration of Social Services, and the Columbia University School of Social Work, in collaboration with the Graduate School of Business and the School of Public Health, has a special training program for executive directors of not-for-profit agencies.[9]

Student Characteristics

Information was secured on age, sex, race-ethnicity, previous social welfare and administrative experience, and previous education of students currently or recently enrolled in social welfare administration specializations. Twenty-five (71%) of the 35 schools reporting such specializations at the master's level provided some of this data.

Previous Experience

Eight of the 35 schools provided specific data concerning the previous experience of students in the master's program administration specialization.[10] These 8 programs provided data for a total of 274 current students and recent graduates. Of these 274, 83 (30%) had less than one year of social welfare experience prior to beginning their study. Seventy-one (38%) had five or more years of social welfare experience.[11]

While not providing specific frequency distributions, 14 programs did provide some description of the previous experience of their master's program students. Of these, 4 reported that all students had some previous experience in social welfare, and the remaining programs indicated that the majority of their students had previous social welfare experience.

Of the three doctoral programs providing data regarding previous experience, all students had previous social welfare administrative experience ranging to a maximum of 20 years.

Fifteen (42%) of the 36 programs reporting social welfare administration specializations at either the master's or doctoral levels did not provide any information regarding the previous experience of their students.[12]

Age

Eighteen (51%) of the 35 schools provided quantitative information concerning the age of students currently or recently in the master's program specialization in administration. Of these, 17 provided statistics descriptive of the average age. The mean age across these 17 programs was 27.5, with a range of 20-59.[13] The age distribution tended to be skewed, with a greater range above the mean of 27.5 than below.[14] Three of the nine doctoral programs provided information on age. The mean age across these was 38, with a range of 28 to 58.[15]

Ethnicity

Twenty (57%) of the 35 programs with master's specializations provided quantitative data regarding ethnicity of their students. Of the 592 students enrolled in these 20 programs, 396 (67%) were white, 138 (23%) were Black, 31 (5%) were Latino, 4 (0.6%) were Asian, and 2 (0.3%) were Indian.[16]

Four of the nine doctoral programs provided statistics regarding ethnicity for their 86 students. Sixty-two (72%) of the doctoral students were white, 12 (14%) were Black, 4 (5%) were Latino, and 7 (8%) were Asian.

Sex

Twenty-one (60%) of the 35 programs reporting master's level specializations provided data on the sex of 615 current students and recent graduates, 261

(42%) of whom were male and 354 (58%) female. The percentage of males ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 70 percent. Eight programs reported less than 35 percent males, whereas six programs reported 60 percent or more. The remaining seven programs reported that the percentage of males ranged from 35 to 59 percent.

Four of the nine doctoral programs provided data on a total of 87 students; of these, 40 (46%) were male. The percentage of males in these four programs was 14, 31, 56, and 61, respectively.[17]

Employment

Twenty-three (66%) of the 35 master's degree programs provided data concerning the nature of post-graduation employment of students specializing in administration. Two programs reported that all of their graduates were employed in administrative positions.[18] Eleven of the 23 programs reported 80 percent or more of their graduates employed in administrative positions. All but one of the remaining 12 programs indicated that from 50 to 80 percent of their graduates were employed in administrative positions.[19] The most frequently mentioned positions were at the mid-management level, although a number of programs reported graduates occupying executive positions in agencies and schools of social work.

One of the 9 doctoral programs provided employment information, indicating that of its 30 graduates since 1968, 10 were teaching administration or policy in schools of social work, 18 were in agency administration, and 2 were deans of schools of social work.

In addition to providing information concerning employment of graduates, programs were asked to describe and evaluate formal mechanisms used by the school to assist their administration students find employment. Ten (29%) programs reported such mechanisms. Four of these indicated that a special placement office assisted such students: 3 noted that the placement service was not very effective in placing students in administrative positions, and one noted that the program was in the process of becoming operative. The remaining 6 programs reported the existence of: a file system of administration openings, arrangement of interviews with prospective employers, and distribution to agencies of a list of prospective graduates, with accompanying resumes.

Many schools reported that graduates were assisted informally by faculty. Others noted that a general university placement service was available. None of the 35 master's level programs reported a formal placement mechanism that they considered to be particularly effective.[20]

Recruitment

The schools were asked to describe any mechanism used to recruit students for

the administration specialization. Thirty-three (94%) of the 35 responding master's programs provided data, and of these, 23 (70%) reported that no particular recruitment procedure existed. Of the remaining 10, the procedure was described in order of frequency as: use of brochures, informal student group meetings, individual consultation with faculty, use of a faculty committee (in one instance an admissions committee that evaluated first-year students for admission into the second-year specialization), and use of general introductory meetings for first-year students for the second-year specialization.

Faculty

Thirty-one (89%) of the 35 master's programs provided information concerning the number of faculty teaching administration specialization courses. This number is one indicator of the resources potentially available to students. The median number of faculty per program was 5, with a range of one to 13.[21]

Thirty (86%) of the 35 master's programs provided information necessary to examine student-faculty ratios. The median student-faculty ratio was 3.8 students per faculty, with a range of .3 to 22.5. Eleven of the programs reported a student-faculty ratio of less than three students per faculty, 11 reported a ratio of between three and five students, and 8 reported a ratio greater than five.[22]

Twenty-six (74%) of the 35 master's programs provided information concerning the highest degree held by faculty teaching administration specialization courses. Of 137 full- and part-time faculty, 93 (68%) held doctorates, with 17 holding DSW degrees, and 76 holding either a PhD or other doctorates.[23] The remaining 44 (32%) held a master's degree in social work.

Five programs reported nine faculty holding advanced degrees in administration or management outside the field of social welfare, seven of whom held doctorates. Two programs reported a faculty member holding both a social welfare and administration advanced degree.[24]

The master-doctorate ratio in the programs varied considerably among the 26 schools providing this information. The median proportion of faculty holding the master's as their highest degree was 28 percent. Three programs reported that all of their faculty teaching the administration specialization courses held doctorates, while one reported no doctorates. Sixteen of the reporting programs indicated that one-third or fewer of their teaching faculty in this area held a master's as their highest degree.[25]

Grant Support

Nine (26%) of the 35 programs reported that the specialization in administration was at least partially funded by a time-limited grant. All of these grants were from public agencies. Federal agencies awarding grants included the

Social and Rehabilitation Services and the National Institute of Mental Health.[26] Two programs reported receipt of financial support from state agencies. Most grants were for training purposes and provided funds for student and/or faculty support. One program reported a federal grant for purposes of curriculum design, research, and curriculum development.[27]

Interdepartmental Study

Thirty (86%) of the 35 programs with specializations in social welfare administration provided information concerning the extent to which students were encouraged to take course work in divisions of their university other than social work. Three (10%) programs reported that all students were required to take courses in other divisions: two of these required students to take courses in administration from the School of Business, while the other allowed the students a choice. In 20 (67%) of the 30 programs, students were not required to take administrative course work in other divisions, but were encouraged to do so. Suggested areas were business administration, public administration, public health, economics, political science, sociology, corrections, education, and medicine. Seven (23%) of the 30 responding programs said that there were no special structural arrangements for administration students to take courses in other divisions, and in 3 of these, all administration courses were based in the school of social work.

Most of the programs that encouraged administration students to take course work in other divisions assessed their experiences with these courses positively, although 2 programs noted that some difficulty had been experienced in the adaptation of general management concepts to the nonprofit field, as well as a relative absence of case material. In 2 programs, while administration students were encouraged to take courses in other divisions, few did so.[28]

Administration Specialization Courses

Thirty-one (89%) of the 35 programs offering a social welfare administration specialization provided information specifying courses offered to students specializing in administration.[29] The median number of courses offered was 7, and the range from 2 to 13. Seven of the 31 programs had fewer than four courses, 9 had four to seven courses, 9 had either eight or nine such courses, and 6 offered more than nine.

The reported courses were grouped according to titles. While some schools provided course outlines and descriptions, generally the information provided did not systematically allow for grouping other than by title. Table 1 presents a summary of the types of courses offered and their relative frequency, the latter of which is shown in the column entitled "currently offered."

The respondents also were asked to indicate what substantive content should

be emphasized in graduate education for social welfare administrative practice. Twenty-two (59%) of the 37 programs with some form of administration specialization program at the master's level (single and dual degree) provided relevant information. These responses have been grouped according to the classification developed for the original typology of courses offered, and their relative frequency is reported in Table 1 under the column "recommended."

TABLE 1
Substantive Content in Administration Curricula: Current and Recommended Offerings Compared by Rank

Substantive Content	Rank[a]	
	Currently Offered	Recommended
Basic Administration	1	8
Advanced Administration	2	—
Supervision and Staff Development	3	4
Organizational Theory and Behavior	4	2
Management Theory and Practice	5	1
Social Planning	6	10
Policy Analysis	7	13
Program Design and Development	8	15
Evaluation	9	7
Finance and Economics	10	5
Research and Statistics	11	—
Proposal Development	12	12
Consultation	13	—
Management Technologies	14	3
Interpersonal Skills	—	6
Social Work Concepts	—	9
Communications	—	11
Intergovernmental Relations	—	14
Other	15	—

[a]The ranking is from most frequently offered or recommended (1) to least frequently offered or recommended (15).

Interpretation of the information presented in Table 1 is somewhat problematic because of uncertainty in the classification scheme. Since the categories are not mutually exclusive, some overlap is unavoidable, and thus the categorization and rankings are somewhat ambiguous.[30] Nevertheless, even if viewed only as suggestive, the information is instructive and suggests the content

areas in which current offerings match recommended offerings, as well as in which areas discrepancies exist.

Current and recommended offerings received similar rankings in the content areas of supervision and staff development, organizational theory and behavior, evaluation, and proposal development. Current offerings appeared to exceed recommended offerings in the content areas of basic and advanced administration, social planning, policy analysis, and program design and development, all of which are ranked as being offered more frequently than their comparable recommended rank. While this also is true of research and statistics, and consultation, these areas received relatively low ranks on current offerings and were not directly mentioned in recommended offerings.

Content areas offered less frequently than recommended included management theory and practice, finance and economics, and management technologies.

Structure of Education for Social Welfare Administrative Practice

Many different models were proposed by the respondents when asked for their view of the most appropriate structure for training social welfare administrators. Of the 37 programs offering some form of education for administrative practice, 29 (78%) answered this question. Four respondents criticized the interdisciplinary perspective, stating that this educational task is best conducted in schools of social work using social work expertise. The remainder were in favor of some form of interdepartmental training. Nine stated that a dual degree approach would be of great value, and the remaining 16 answered that schools of social work could use expertise from business, management, and public administration faculties to great advantage.

Although 86 percent of the responding schools favored some type of interdepartmental approach (as discussed earlier), the opinion that such education must remain under the control of schools of social work was nearly universal. According to one respondent, "Only within this context can a philosophy and basic understanding of social work be supplied." Another added, "Social work agencies should be administered by social workers." This view was reiterated in an additional statement that schools of social work must ensure that they set the tone for administrative practice by presenting it within a social welfare framework. One respondent, noting the limitations of general education in administration, commented: "Programs in economics or business tend to emphasize . . . the profit sector with a limited understanding of human service delivery systems." This view was shared by many of those responding.

Addressing the question of the level at which this education should take place, the responding schools presented several perspectives. Generally, it was suggested that organization theory be stressed at the AA and BSW levels, and

that the application be elaborated at the MSW level. Specialization in research, systems analysis, and consultation was proposed for the doctoral level. All 12 of the respondents expressing an opinion maintained that the master's level was the most appropriate and realistic for educating social welfare administrators. For a few respondents, doctoral work was seen as preparation for advanced practice rather than as a basis for teaching and research. The role of continuing education was strongly emphasized, both as a way of providing skills in administration to direct service workers in management positions, and as a means of updating the education of those already trained in administrative practice.

Administration in a Planning-Policy Curriculum Context

In responding to the question about a specialization in administrative practice, seven schools (11% of all 61 respondents) noted that while they did not treat administration as a separate practice area, it was included in the larger macro-practice program they offered. One program included administration in its curriculum with policy and planning. Another included administration in its organizational planning and administration sequence. A program in planning/policy/administration/development was offered by a third. Administration was subsumed in the community services and social planning concentration at another school of social work. A fifth program offered a specialization in social development, which included such areas as social welfare policy, community organization, and health planning. Although there was no specific education for administration per se, administrative material was offered as part of the social development curriculum.

A large state-supported university had a program in administration, policy, planning and organization, which offered material in administration. A special project drew students from social welfare agencies and provided education in social work and administration. This, however, was not an institutionalized component of the curriculum, but rather a time-limited project, funded by the university and HEW.

Findings and Conclusions

Specialized education for social welfare administrative practice at the graduate level in schools of social work has grown rapidly in the last five years. Over half of the responding graduate schools offered a specialization at the master's level whose objective was preparation for social welfare administrative practice (57%), and nearly three-quarters (73%) of the specializations had been in existence for five or fewer years.

Similarly, 15 percent of the responding programs offered such a specialization at the doctoral level and, of these, over half (five of nine) were initiated within

the two years prior to the study. This rapid development was also evident concerning dual degree programs, with 11 percent of the responding programs offering a dual degree program whose objective was preparation for social welfare administrative practice (in collaboration with either schools of public administration or graduate schools of business). All but one of the programs had been initiated within the two previous years.

The overwhelming majority of graduate students in social work administrative practice specializations were enrolled in social work master's programs (the median number of students per program was 17, with a range of 2-82 full-time students). Student enrollment in dual degree programs tended to be relatively small (a median of 8 students per program, with a range of 9-19). The fewest number of administration students were at the doctoral level (excluding one exceptionally large program, the other eight doctoral programs reported enrollment ranging from one to 14, with a median of 5.5).

Students in administration specializations at the master's level in the reporting programs more frequently were male (42%) and more frequently a member of a minority group (33%) than students in other specializations in social work master's programs (32.8% and 18.4%, respectively). These students, however, did not appear to be different in age (a median of 27.5) or extent of previous social welfare work experience (30% reportedly having had less than one year of work experience).

While relatively few programs (29%) reported formal mechanisms for assisting students to find employment subsequent to graduation in social welfare administrative positions, a majority of program graduates did secure employment in social welfare administrative positions, usually at the mid-management level.

Over two-thirds of the faculty teaching administration specialization courses held doctorates, and one-fifth of the programs included among their faculty individuals holding advanced degrees in administration from disciplines other than social work.

Over one-fourth of the reporting programs were partially supported by funds received from time-limited grants. No school received such funds from voluntary agencies or foundations: all of the grants came from public agencies, most often SRS or NIMH.

Over three-quarters (77%) of the responding programs with specializations in administration at the master's level either encouraged or required students to take courses in other divisions of the university, usually in business administration, public administration, public health, economics, political science, sociology, corrections, education, or medicine. Only three schools (10%) reported that all course work was taken within the program. Most programs reported general satisfaction with the interdepartmental study, although a number indicated that some difficulty occurred around adapting administrative content to the social welfare context.

The median number of administration specialization courses offered in master's programs was seven. A comparison of courses offered in administration specializations with the respondents' opinion regarding what substantive content should be emphasized in graduate education for social welfare administrative practice indicated apparent discrepancies. Current offerings exceeded recommended offerings in the content areas of basic and advanced administration, social planning, policy analysis, and program design and development. Content areas offered less frequently than recommended included management theory and practice, finance and economics, and management technologies.

Concerning the education for social welfare administrative practice, nearly all of the respondents expressed the opinion that such education should be under the administrative control of schools of social work, although the overwhelming majority (86%) favored interdisciplinary education. While dual degree programs were favored by most of those expressing an opinion, a few viewed these programs with skepticism.

The master's level was seen as the most appropriate educational level for social welfare administrative practice specialization, although a number of the respondents favored such education at both the baccalaureate and the doctoral levels. The respondents strongly supported continuing education for administrative practice oriented both to individuals occupying administrative positions without formal training, as well as to individuals wishing to "update" or expand their knowledge of administrative practice.

The findings of this survey should be considered in the context of its limitations. The data submitted by the respondents was of unknown validity, and the information has been reported as provided. A further limitation to be considered when attempting to apply the findings to the entire population of schools of social work, is the incomplete response rate. While 73 percent of the CSWE-accredited graduate schools returned the survey questionnaire, for a number of the questionnaire items the response rate was much lower. In spite of these limitations, the findings of this survey hopefully will be useful as a guide to further research and planning.

Notes

1. This survey to some extent updates the statistical information gathered in a 1974 survey of 78 graduate schools of social work reported in: Kenneth J. Kazmerski and David Macarov, *Administration in the Social Work Curriculum* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976). This survey was designed to address additional areas as well, which are of particular relevance to the proposal. For additional statistical information regarding education for administrative practice, see *Summary Information on Master of Social Work Programs: 1977* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1977).

2. This compares with a response rate of 68 percent (53 programs) reported in the Kazmerski and Macarov survey, *op. cit.*

3. The distribution of programs by number of students specializing in social welfare administrative

practice was: 1-10 = 6; 11-20 = 12; 21-30 = 7; 31 and over = 8.

4. This compares with two joint-degree programs reported during the 1974-75 academic year in Kazmerski and Macarov, *op. cit.*, p. 18, and with three dual degree programs reported in Rino J. Patti et al., *Educating for Management in Social Welfare: A Report of the Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project* (Seattle, Wash.: The School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington, July 1976), p. 17.

5. Ohio State University, the University of Denver, the University of Kentucky, and the University of Southern California.

6. Columbia University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Alabama.

7. Case Western Reserve University, Florida State University, the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, the University of Alabama, and the University of Texas at Arlington.

8. Catholic University of America, Ohio State University, and the University of Southern California.

9. For more information on such programs see E. Schaub and S. B. Cohen, "Report on a National Survey of Sixty-Three Graduate Schools of Social Work Offering Continuing Education Programs in Social Welfare Administration and Management," in *National Project on Education for Management of Social Services* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1975); and M. Patterson, "Report on a Survey of Thirty-Eight Short-Term Educational Programs for Administration and Management in the Social Services," in *ibid.*

10. With only a few exceptions, schools did not make explicit whether the figures referred to social welfare or non-social welfare experience, and most often did not specify administrative experience.

11. Of the eight programs, only six provided data usable in this calculation. The total number of students in these six programs was 188.

12. One of the 15 reported that while this information was available under current policy, it could not be released.

13. The schools provided varying data concerning the average age of their students including means, medians, and ranges. The mean reported above is a mean of the estimated median for the 17 programs. The range is assumed to be from 20 to 59, although various programs reported frequency distributions in which the ranges extended from "less than" to "more than" a specific age.

14. Three additional programs—while not providing quantitative data—did note in two instances that the students in this concentration were older than other students, and the third noted that students were in their late 20s and early 30s.

15. This mean is based on an estimate calculated from the varying data provided.

16. The 20 programs ranged from a low of 8.3 percent of minority students to a high of 97 percent. Five of the 20 reported fewer than 20 percent minority students, whereas 7 reported greater than 30 percent. The remaining 8 programs reported between 20 and 30 percent. The data did not distinguish Asian from Asian-American, or Indians from American Indians. Twenty-one (3.5%) of the 592 master's students were reported as "other."

17. Compared to other students in graduate social work programs, the administration students in this sample were more frequently male—42 percent compared with 32.8 percent of all full-time social work master's students—and more frequently from an ethnic minority group—33 percent of the students compared with 18.4 percent of all full-time social work master's students. These students did not appear to vary in age or previous experience. See Joseph C. Sheehan, ed., *Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1975* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976).

18. These two programs reported 28 and 2 graduates, respectively.

19. One school reported that from 15 to 20 percent of its graduates were employed in administrative positions; however, the validity of this response was questionable in view of its low percentage. It may be that this program provided figures for its total student body rather than just for administration students.

20. See N. Radin, *A Follow-Up Study of Social Work Graduates with Implications for Social Work Education* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1974); and R. C. Sarri and J. M. Riley, "Graduates of the Social Welfare Administration Sequence: Where They Are and How They View the Curriculum," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 19 (April/May 1971), pp. 53-56.

21. Since only 4 of the 31 programs distinguished between full- and part-time faculty, these figures indicated combined full- and part-time faculty. Also, they are based on a total of 165 faculty reported as teaching either full- or part-time.

22. These ratios did not reflect the number of full-time equivalent faculty teaching only

administration specialization courses, since the data usually did not specify full- or part-time status or proportion of faculty time used for administration specialization course teaching.

23. Schools reporting nonspecific doctorates (which may have included DSWs) were classified as "PhD or other."

24. For comparable data see Kazmerski and Macarov, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

25. Data are not available concerning faculty teaching in the doctoral programs.

26. One program reported a grant in Corrections Administration but did not specify the granting agency.

27. For further detail concerning research and development projects funded by SRS relevant to education for social welfare administration, see Kazmerski and Macarov, *op. cit.*; Patti et al., *op. cit.*; and *National Project on Education for Management, op. cit.*

28. Only one doctoral program provided information concerning interdepartmental study for administration students, and noted that team teaching was used with faculty in Public Administration and Economics. Other administration courses in other departments were taught with a social welfare orientation. Advanced planning was important in the selection of such courses.

29. It was assumed that the reported courses were in addition to the general social work courses available to all students.

30. The substantive content areas listed in Table 1 are described as follows: *basic administration*—introductory courses concerned with the basic techniques and principles of social welfare administrative practice; *advanced administration*—included here are courses in administration above the introductory level, for example, Politics of Social Program Administration, Analytic Tools in Administration, and Problems in the Practice of Social Welfare Administration; *supervision and staff development*—courses concerned with personnel management in social welfare organizations; *organizational theory and behavior*—included here is a wide range of courses dealing with basic organizational theory and the functioning of social welfare organizations; *management theory and practice*—courses dealing with general management issues and the principles of organizational control in the area of social welfare; *social planning*—in this group are courses dealing with the concepts and methodologies of planning for social welfare; *policy analysis*—this covers a wide variety of courses ranging from an introduction to the techniques of policy analysis to specific policy areas such as income maintenance and corrections. This group also includes courses in the area of social legislation; *program design and development*—courses covering the structure of human service delivery systems and ways in which programs can be shaped to fit particular needs; *evaluation*—included here are courses in the design and implementation of methods to monitor programs and evaluate their performance; *finance and economics*—these are courses concerned with methods for raising funds and controlling their expenditure in social welfare organizations. Also included here are courses dealing with economic theory as it applies to social welfare; *research and statistics*—courses that cover basic principles of research and statistical analysis for social welfare administrators; *proposal development*—these courses deal with the process of obtaining funds through proposal writing; *consultation*—included in this group are courses dealing with the role of the consultant in social welfare administrative practice; *management technologies*—this group covers a broad range of material in such areas as computers, operations research, management information systems, decision making, and the management-by-objectives system; *interpersonal skills*—this group was not sharply defined by the respondents. It seemed to refer to those skills necessary for an administrator to manage an organization without undue interpersonal conflict; *social work concepts*—courses dealing with the fundamentals of social work practice necessary for those who wish to specialize in social welfare administration; *communications*—included in this group are courses dealing with communications within social welfare organizations; *intergovernmental relations*—courses concerned with the relations between the federal, state, and local levels of government; *other*—these are courses that do not fit easily into the other categories. Included are such titles as the Process of Institutionalization, Public Relations, Strategies for System Change, the Ombudsman and Other Advocacy Systems, and Laboratory in Administration.

Chapter 3

Selected Findings and Conclusions

Social welfare services constitute a major sector of the institutional structures for social and economic development in the United States. In terms of the vast number of people served, the sums of money expended, and the increasing number of people employed, it is comparable in complexity to our largest industries.

The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported a 15.7 percent increase in expenditures for public social services during the 1976 fiscal year, an increase of $45 billion.[1] This increase reflects the growing responsibility for social welfare that the federal government has assumed. Prior to 1966 the federal share of the cost of social welfare was less than 50 percent; in 1976 this had increased to 60 percent. It is important to note that the 1974-75 recession and the sky-rocketing inflation rate were reflected in the increased cost to the federal government.

There is perhaps no more critical issue confronting social welfare organizations today than the need for personnel with special competencies in management and administration. More recently in the context of scarce governmental resources, growing emphasis has been placed upon increasing the efficiency of social programs and assessing their impact on client populations. A natural accompaniment of these developments has been the search for more sophisticated management methods and tools that would enhance the performance of social welfare programs and make them more accountable to policy makers, consumers, and other constituencies. The quality of the administration of social welfare programs is the keystone for the achievement of optimum efficiency and effectiveness in achieving their programmatic goals.

There is one basic conclusion that can be drawn from the material in the first two chapters of this monograph, and from consultation with key educators and administrators concerned with improving the quality of administration of social welfare programs: there is an urgent need for continued and increased support of those educational systems presently involved in upgrading the knowledge and refining the skills for the more adequate preparation of social work administrators at the middle and executive levels, in both the voluntary and public sectors.

The major issues in education for effective social welfare administration have been identified in the literature. Some of them have been addressed, in part, in

programs financed by the Public Services Administration of the former Social and Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. With Section 426 training grants at the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Southern California, and the University of Washington, significant advances have been made in the development and integration of new knowledge for increased effectiveness in social welfare administration. However, as yet, no empirical studies of the career patterns of persons administering public and voluntary social welfare services have produced any definitive evidence on which to evaluate the efficacy of current educational programs.

Interviews with a small number of administrators of large-scale public and voluntary social welfare service programs revealed that few had any formal education in social administration. Most of them came to their administrative positions with experience in such fields as business or education, or by moving up from jobs in direct service provision. A number were graduates of schools of social work but had not pursued an educational concentration in social policy or administration.

A number of selected findings were produced by a review of the scattered efforts to examine the career background of those currently administering public and voluntary social welfare service programs, the summary and implications of the literature review presented in Chapter 1, and the findings in Chapter 2 of the survey of curriculum developments and offerings in schools of social work, including those academically linked with schools of business administration, public administration, law, and psychiatry. The findings were as follows:

1. There is an absence of systematic frameworks or models for organizing existing social welfare administrative practice knowledge. While considerable potentially relevant knowledge has been developed by various disciplines about what administrators in social welfare settings should know, it has not been systematically organized or utilized in ways that will promote effective social welfare administrative practice. Our investigations, though of limited scope and designed to respond to the assignment financed by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, have led us to identify four currently unmet needs that must be satisfied if the social welfare institution is to be assured of an increased measure of effective administrative practice (these are listed below).
2. There is disagreement, and at times confusion, concerning the most appropriate structural arrangements for social welfare administrative practice education. The variety of available options has not been tested systematically. Several subissues require examination:
   a. Should such education be interdisciplinary?

b. Should it be interprofessional?
c. If either (a) or (b), how should the barriers in existing university structures be dealt with in order to achieve implementation?
d. Should full responsibility be assigned to schools of social work or to schools of business management and at what level on the educational spectrum?

3. There is a marked discrepancy between the number of social workers employed in administrative positions (50%) or performing administrative functions (91%),[2] and the number of students enrolled in administrative specialization in schools of social work. According to the Council on Social Work Education, 4 percent of all students in schools of social work are enrolled in an administrative specialization.[3] The number of students in dual degree programs in social work administration is less than 50 throughout the country.[4]

Priority Needs

The four unmet needs that the authors identified through their investigations reported on in this monograph are:

1. A need to increase the number of students enrolled in programs designed to equip graduates to function responsibly and effectively in administrative practice at the middle and top levels of administration, with priority given to the public social welfare sector.
2. An urgent need to organize knowledge around the concept of effectiveness and efficiency within the context of the question: What qualities increase or decrease the probability of effective and efficient administrative practice?
3. An urgent need to organize continuing education programs in social welfare administration for those graduates of schools of social work who have concentrated in their professional preparation on direct service provision to individuals and families. MSW social workers are likely to follow the traditional career pattern of those who move or are moved into administrative practice at the middle-management or executive levels. Associated with the development of continuing education programs is the need to evaluate the impact of administrator training on administrative performance. This evaluation should have immediate and high priority for continuing education for administrative practice.
4. A need to test the relevance and efficacy of the field instruction models currently being used for direct social service delivery, as a preparation for administrative practice.

Notes

1. "Social Welfare Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1976," *The Social Security Bulletin* (December 1977), Note 22.
2. A. M. Stamm, "NASW Membership: Characteristics, Deployment and Salaries," *Personnel Information*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1969), pp. 34-45.
3. Allen Rubin and G. Robert Whitcomb, comp., *Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1977* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1978), p. 53.
4. This is one of the findings of the survey that was conducted by the authors and is being reported on in this monograph.

Chapter 4

Organization and Support for New Efforts Toward Education For Effective Social Welfare Administrative Practice

In order to develop the number and variety of efforts required to address the needs outlined in Chapter Three, the authors recommend that foundation and increased governmental support be provided to establish regional centers for the development of knowledge for education of social welfare administrators, and for the development and dissemination of the educational technology required for utilization of this knowledge. At least three regional centers should be established and based in three universities located in different geographic areas of the United States. They could comprise a consortium of institutions of learning that already have demonstrated a commitment to education for effective and efficient social welfare administration. Each of the regional centers would be assigned a range of educational research activities designed to document issues that need attention, and to identify activities required to impact on those issues.

Based on the preliminary activities already undertaken in several graduate education programs of social work, business, and public administration, those activities might include the following:

1. Applied research for the enrichment of the knowledge base in the field of social administration required to serve as a basis for the effective preparation of persons engaged in administrative practice in social welfare at the middle and executive levels of management. These research efforts should include a refined definition of the tasks and functions of administrative practice in social welfare.
2. A critical, systematic examination of methods for multidisciplinary education for social welfare administrative practice, including an assessment of the existing dual degree programs and their variations. This also would include the identification of barriers existing in university systems that interfere with development of an integrated interdisciplinary

and multidisciplinary approach to education for administrative practice in social welfare.

3. Testing the efficacy of alternate models for agency-based learning for social welfare administrative practice.

4. Developing teaching materials such as case studies and visual aids that reflect an integration of those disciplines in the academic setting that are relevant to education for social welfare administration.

5. Planning and implementation of a series of conferences among the consortium of regional centers to assess the achievements of the individual centers, and to devise strategies to avoid duplication of effort. The new knowledge and teaching modalities developed by the centers would have utility for social work education programs, schools of business administration, schools of public administration, continuing education, and in-service training programs. They also should reflect a rich interdisciplinary body of knowledge, skills, and experiences that would have invaluable utility for administrators and middle-management personnel engaged in or preparing for administrative practice in social welfare.

6. Studies designed to identify the criteria for effectiveness in social welfare administration and to develop methods and tools for evaluation of administrative practice.

7. Conducting a series of continuing education programs for administrators and middle-management personnel. These institutes would be given by qualified faculty involved in the educational activities of the regional centers. The persons selected to participate in the institutes would be administrative and middle-management personnel recently appointed to such positions or about to assume responsibilities in either the public or private sector.

Recommendations

The authors believe that the Council on Social Work Education would be the most appropriate organization to perform the coordinating and facilitating functions related to the proposed regional centers. The Council's close relationship with the accredited graduate and undergraduate social work programs in the United States results in a close, on-going relationship with the larger university systems, and provides an opportunity for linkages between and among the various disciplines within the universities. Its primary goals include the improvement of the quality of social work education at all levels of training, and the planning and development of new programs to meet the demands of changing service delivery systems.

As the only standard-setting agency in all areas of social work education, the Council provides leadership and services through a wide range of activities including accreditation, research, consultation, providing information, pub-

lishing, and conducting training seminars.

In recent years the Council has given increased attention to ways of enhancing the quality of educational offerings that would assure more adequate preparation of social work students for administrative/management practice in social welfare systems.

In 1974 the Council received support from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to begin to assist social work programs in assessing their curriculum offerings in administration and management. Unfortunately, due to a change in the federal legislation, the Council received project support for only one year. Therefore it has not been possible to pursue the issues identified during this one-year activity, nor has it been possible to participate with social work education programs in developing more systematic strategies for strengthening educational programs in administration.

The coordinating function that might be provided by the Council would assure continuity among the regional centers. Some of the functions which the Council could perform would include the following:

1. Development of criteria for the selection of the schools invited to participate in the program.
2. Coordinate the activities of the regional centers.
3. Plan and implement the regional center meetings and a national conference on social welfare administration.
4. Staff a national advisory committee. This committee would be multidisciplinary in nature, comprised of persons of national prominence in social work education, social work administration, and education in the fields of business and public administration. It also would include representation from organizations such as the American Public Welfare Association and the American Management Association.
5. Participate in the development, dissemination, and implementation of the recommendations developed as a result of this project.

These activities would assure a significant national impact on the education and training of social work students and practitioners in the field of social welfare administration and management.

Chapter 5

Implications for Future Action: Four Reactions

Four social work educators who have demonstrated scholarship in education for social welfare administration were invited to review the findings and recommendations of the materials presented in this monograph. Each of the four scholar's reactions is presented as reflecting the range of interest and concern of social work educators in the area of social administration.

The following comments on the earlier chapters of this monograph were made by James O. F. Hackshaw, professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

In a field in which social welfare expenditures amounted to 27.3 percent of the GNP in 1975, increased attention is being directed to the management of the service programs to ensure effectiveness, efficiency, and equity in their delivery.[1] Management functions must be strengthened not only to deal with the present complexity of services that these expenditures represent, but also to plan, develop, and manage the newer and even more complex service systems that are emerging. This places a particular responsibility on urban schools of social work involved in the development of management curricula, teaching, and research, to reflect the realities of the urban environment.

In the recently conducted feasibility study dealing with education for effective administrative practice in the field of social welfare that is discussed in the first four chapters of this monograph, a significant finding was the "absence of a systematic framework or model for organizing the social welfare administrative practice knowledge that currently exists." An organizing framework or model is a sine qua non for the analysis of management functions against which educational objectives can be specified and curricula planned.

Attention given to the development and use of an overarching framework allows for the specification of the desired outcomes of social service program interventions, the delineation of management tasks internal and external to the organization, the identification of the appropriate technologies required, and

the range of skills necessary to effect the intervention. These elements should be seen in the context of the values and ethics of the social work profession. In addition, such a framework provides a context for viewing social services in an arena of competing interest groups. This degree of specificity would provide the backdrop for identifying the knowledge base for the educational program and would bridge the gap between theory, technique, and practice.

The development of a framework has implications for the determination of the appropriate mix of interdisciplinary and interprofessional collaboration for education in the management of the large-scale, complex, formal organization, a major tool for delivering social services in a modern industrial society. The use of a framework would suggest the content for the development of a recruitment strategy to increase student enrollment in management programs beyond the present 4 percent pursuing such a specialization.[2]

An organizing framework would point up the ingredients for continuing education programs in management practice for staff members at all levels of the organization, thus eliminating the imbalance caused by having only a selected few.

Finally, the use of a framework would provide a built-in accountability for evaluating social service outcomes.

The following reactions to the proposal abstract were made by Rino Patti, coordinator of the Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project at the University of Washington School of Social Work.

The national survey of administration curricula described in Chapter Two makes an important contribution to relatively recent efforts to assess the extent and quality of teaching and learning in social welfare administration and its relevance to effective management practice in social programs. The data speak largely for themselves and require little comment or elaboration. Rather, I would like to respond briefly to several statements contained in Chapter Four that suggest future strategies for developing education for management practice in social welfare.

First, while I would agree that there is an apparent need to increase the supply of well-trained management specialists for middle and top levels of administration in social welfare, schools should take care to assess whether there is an *effective demand* for recent graduates in this sector of the job market. We should have much better information about the universe of management jobs in social welfare, the number of replacements that occur yearly, the educational and experiential prerequisites required of candidates for promotion at different levels, the hiring preferences of potential employers, and so on.

The Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project at the University of Washington recently completed a national survey of personnel

policies and hiring preferences in public welfare agencies which suggested that program knowledge and direct practice skills are important requisite qualifications for lower-level management jobs of the kinds that many graduates will be seeking.[3] This kind of job market analysis has a number of implications for student recruitment and curriculum design and ultimately for the ability of graduates to compete for management positions. Further work of this nature should be done in geographic regions and in several subfields of social welfare—for example, mental health, aging, corrections, and so on.

Second, I heartily agree with the idea that effectiveness in practice should be the principal organizing concept for research and theory development efforts. There is a paucity of systematic research on this subject in the human services. Such research will not be easy to design or implement. I would favor convening a national group of scholars and researchers to identify an agenda and do some of the developmental work that will be a necessary foundation for productive research on management practice effectiveness. Certainly there is much that can be drawn from the social and management sciences to inform this effort, but I believe it is critical that there be an active program of research on management practice within the field. Without this, prospects for developing sound educational programs in social welfare administration are dim.

Third, continuing education in management is without doubt one of the priority needs in social welfare. However, the problem is not in mounting such programs: there is ample evidence that schools can organize continuing education programs with dispatch. Rather, my view is that the more pressing problem is to develop meaningful linkages with agency consumers so that employees who matriculate in such programs will do so as part of a deliberate plan of career development in which the agency and employee have agreed upon mutual obligations and expectations. Concomitantly, schools and agencies must invest more seriously in the process of determining how continuing education provided under different structural and curriculum arrangements contributes to subsequent managerial performance.

Finally, in relation to models of field instruction, I would hope, as the authors suggest, that we examine the usefulness of traditional field instruction methods for management education. There is at least some reason to question the efficacy of an apprenticeship approach to skill training in administration. Laboratory education and learning centers are among several emerging models of field education that should be demonstrated and evaluated systematically.

As we enter a period that we hope will be one of intensive capacity building in the management area, it is important to keep in mind that there has been an historic indifference and even hostility within social work education to the idea of preparing social workers for administrative practice. This legacy will not be quickly or easily overcome. Our first, and perhaps most difficult task, is to stimulate a receptivity within social work education to the notion that management is a legitimate expression of professional practice.

The following remarks on the earlier chapters of this monograph were made by Harold H. Weissman, associate professor at the School of Social Work, Hunter College of the City University of New York.

This monograph presents a picture of a rapidly expanding area of social work education. This expansion of training for administration is long overdue. What must be done is to ensure that it proceeds in an effective and efficient manner.

Rapid expansion of curriculum areas in response to societal concerns is not a new phenomenon in social work education—witness the development of community organization concentrations in the 1960s. It is therefore crucial that the Council on Social Work Education monitor and guide the development of administration sequences. A task force should be created, with appropriate staffing, to deal with the complex issues of interdisciplinary cooperation, curriculum integration, practicum, and adequacy of training sites.

Perhaps the most pressing problem noted in this report is the need for post-master's continuing education programs. The present pattern of promotion from the service ranks to administration will remain the predominant pattern for the foreseeable future, since the number of students trained in administration will not meet the need for agency administrators. In addition, it is of questionable value to restrict access to the administrative ranks to those who have a master's degree in administration, since the interests of workers change over time and agency reward systems often depend on the interest of staff in promotion.

From a professional, organizational, and individual worker vantage point, continuing education programs are the most viable strategy for improving the effectiveness of social welfare administration. This area of education has traditionally been allocated the fewest resources by schools, and the faculties generally have shown little interest in continuing education. Therefore a great deal of work needs to be done in order to develop creative and useful post-master's programs that go beyond limited summer institutes, one-shot courses, and in-service training.

Looking at alternative ways of (1) recruiting students, (2) developing faculty, (3) relating curriculum to current agency administrative concerns, (4) credentialling students, and (5) evaluating effectiveness of post-master's programs will require more resources than most schools have available. But with foundation assistance, experimental programs might be set up in selected areas and schools to insure a cumulative and orderly development of education for improving effectiveness of social welfare administration.

The following reactions to the proposal abstract were made by Edward E. Schwartz, professor emeritus at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

The proposal on education for social welfare administration is directed toward improving the organization of knowledge concerning its practice, improving and testing educational structures and methods for teaching it, and increasing the number of administrators who are prepared for practice in this specialization. Following are brief comments on these emphases.

Ways of organizing the knowledge of social work administration have been outlined in numerous curriculum plans and course syllabi and in a few readers and textbooks. None of these ways has achieved general acceptance, and perhaps this is a good thing. There is a need for new formulations that will place the study and practice of social work administration in a more comprehensive and useful context. One approach to this is comparative analysis, which points up the similarities and differences between administration of social welfare and other fields and enterprises, and also among different types of social welfare enterprises. Such analysis facilitates the process of selective and appropriate application of general organizational and administrative theory and techniques developed in other fields of administrative practice to specific social welfare administration problems and situations.

In this context, a strategic variable for comparative analysis is what is variously termed *purpose, mission, goal,* or *function.* This variable is critical in the selection and application of criteria for program evaluation and decision making. As a criterion for evaluating the operation of social welfare programs, the term *effectiveness* is likely to be more acceptable among social workers than the term *efficiency.* Yet social workers can accept the concept of cost-effectiveness, which is one version of efficiency. Although effectiveness can in this sense be subsumed under efficiency, criteria derived from humanistic values that are central to the social work ethic, such as individual autonomy, justice, and equality, cannot be subsumed, or at least not without tortuous extension.

Value orientation is, of course, a critical element in considerations of interprofessional and interdisciplinary relationships. Social welfare administration, business administration, educational administration, and health administration all draw upon the same academic disciplines—for example, sociology, political science, economics, psychology, and mathematics. These disciplines are substantively interrelated in the form of generic organizational and administrative theories and also through direct borrowing of techniques from the various fields of administrative practice. The corpus of organizational and administrative theory can be brought into education for social welfare administration in a variety of ways, ranging from (1) appointment of professional social workers who are qualified to teach administration (Clyde Kluckholm's "two skills in one skull"), through (2) appointment of experts in the various pertinent disciplines, or (3) appointment of teachers of business or public administration, to (4) sending social work students to other schools and departments. The higher the degree level, the easier and more effective will be administrative devices for importing the academic disciplines into the social work curriculum. For

example, doctoral students have considerably more freedom and opportunity than master's students to explore the range of university resources in pursuing their special interests.

Interprofessional programs, particularly those in the form of joint degree master's programs, are another kettle of fish. The attraction of such programs for schools of social work appears to lie in gaining access to the higher development of other schools in the teaching and practice of certain techniques, especially those that are mathematically based. For the other schools involved, the attraction may be partly to gain a larger student market.

Innovative joint ventures by schools can indicate flexibility and provide opportunities for growth, but only if the structure provides for *de facto* as well as *de jure* equality of faculty and students of both schools and reciprocal relations between them. Some evidences of equality and reciprocity are equivalent standards for admission to the schools involved, a balance of students who come with a primary interest in each of the fields represented, and a balance among faculty from each school who teach joint program courses on administration. A desirable feature would be joint appointments in the two schools for all faculty teaching students in the joint program.

Optimally, joint programs can provide structure for innovation through intellectual collaboration that can lead—even though with great difficulty—to worthwhile integration and synthesis of present course offerings and to other valuable benefits. At the lowest level, joint programs that offer two degrees through increasing the number of courses that will be accepted as fulfilling the course requirements of the other can represent an academic snare as well as a delusion. Schools of social work are not fulfilling their responsibility if they offer concentrations in administration at either the master's or doctoral level when their input consists chiefly of referring their students to courses in other schools or departments.

Concentrations in social work administration can be developed at the master's and doctoral levels but hardly at the bachelor's level, because of the dual demands for educating and acculturating students to the social welfare field in which they will administer, as well as assisting them in gaining knowledge and skills in administration.

The present 4, 2, 3+ structure of education for social welfare administration (and for other social work concentrations) is not immutable and can be shortened and improved in a number of ways. Some schools of social work are already admitting students without degrees in social work to their doctoral programs. A three-year graduate concentration leading to a doctoral degree is feasible, and is also attractive to students. Rather than arousing the fears and antagonisms of some established social work educators by proposals to abolish the master's degree program, it would seem more strategic and effective to consider lengthening it to three years and then awarding a doctoral degree. The apparently successful experience of law schools in retitling their three-year LLB

degree as an LLD degree is instructive. A three-year graduate program leading to a doctoral degree will seem more attractive to most students than a three-year graduate program leading to two MAs.

Continuing education represents a highly cost-effective way of increasing the supply of formally prepared social welfare administrators. However, one-shot courses or scattered workshops are not likely to yield positive measurable benefits. Continuing education must in fact be "continuing" or "sustained" from the viewpoint of the student as well as the teaching institution. One way of promoting a more sustained experience would be admission of selected social work practitioners with or without a master's degree in social work, with adequate credit given for master's courses in social work.

The difficulty of preparing social workers for administrative practice has been described in the literature in detail, but the advantages that social workers possess for administration have not been widely recognized. Among these are their knowledge and skills in human relations, and their knowledge of the culture of social agencies and of the problems, techniques, and psychology of the front-line operators. Perhaps an even less obvious potential advantage of social work education programs over others (and one which is generally seen as a disadvantage) is its extensive scope, including as it does both micro and macro practice.

An imbalance in organizational and administrative theories is the underemphasis on the external tasks of administration. The recognition of this imbalance has led to an increased interest in interorganizational and open systems theory in social work. The study of social policy, community work, and planning can provide a more advanced base for the application of interorganizational, open system, and ecological perspectives than is readily available in other schools, such as business or public administration. The effective integration of the teaching of social welfare policy, administration, and community work requires further conceptualization, but promises to yield more comprehensive and cogent teaching and practice models than are now in use.

In spite of the marked increase during the past five years in the number of educational programs that teach social work administration, the number of social workers who will move into administrative positions in the foreseeable future is not likely to increase significantly unless the kind of action suggested in the statement on priority needs by Dumpson, Mullen, and First is taken. Their recommendations for the organization and support for new efforts in education for administration practice are experientially based, and like most other proposals in this area, require testing and development before being considered for widespread adoption.

The pressing need to improve the quantity and quality of education for social work can probably best be met in an evenhanded way by building into innovative programs measures for comparing their outcomes with those of current programs that are well-established.

Notes

1. "Social Indicators 1976," *The Social Security Bulletin* (January 1976).
2. Allen Rubin and G. Robert Whitcomb, comp., *Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1977* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1978), p. 53.
3. Richard Elmore, Michele Hawkins, Philip Osborne, and Rino Patti, "Social Welfare Management Curriculum Development Project Report," mimeographed (Seattle: University of Washington, February 1976).